



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,337	11/25/2003	Il Nah	P24481	3926

7055 7590 01/21/2005

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER

KYLE, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3676

DATE MAILED: 01/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

10/720,337

Applicant(s)

NAH, IL

Examiner

Michael J Kyle

Art Unit

3676

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 December 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.


Claim(s) rejected: 1-14, as recited in the Final Office Action.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____


Chuck Y. Mah
Primary Examiner

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendment to claims 6 and 13 changes the limitation "pentagonal" to "polygonal". This proposed change broadens the claim and requires further consideration .

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Gauron fails to disclose a plurality of gaps between the sidewalls of the insert nut and a surface of an installation hole. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner considers each space between a flat portion of the nut (78, 90, 92) and the surface of an installation hole to be gap. These gaps are present at 2 sides of the insert nut (180 degrees opposite one another). There are no limitations in the claims that preclude such an interpretation. Applicant argues there is no motivation to combine Quaney with Gauron. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Quaney teaches that any polygonal shape is suitable to provide resistance to torque. In column 2, line 60, to column 3, line 2, Quaney explains that greatest resistance to twisting as the bolt is torqued comes from portions of the flanges that are the greatest distance from the center of the bolt, and continues to state that it is preferable to have corners of the extend out as far as convenient from the axis of the bolt. This is a feature that Gauron does not have, as Gauron shows flats and rounded areas. Modifying Gauron as taught by Quaney, such that the portions are polygonal, will result in increased resistance to torque, over the Gauron's present configuration. Therefore, such a modification would be desirable and is suggested by Quaney..